

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated September 18, 2008, claims 1-27 were rejected and claims 28-62 were subject to restriction. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative Jennifer Bush exchanged telephone call and voicemails with Examiner McLean to resolve the issue presented in the Notice of Non-compliant Amendment. Namely, the Examiner's provisional election of claims 1-27 (and the prior amendment to the same), in light of claims 1-27 previously having been canceled. In a message left by Examiner McLean on November 24, 2008, Examiner McLean indicated that Applicants should respond by submitting new claims with the desired subject matter. Applicants have done so herein.

Response to Restriction Requirement

The Examiner indicated in the Restriction Requirement dated September 18, 2008 that claims 28-62, submitted in the previous amendment, were directed to an invention independent to original claims 1-27, and thus constructively elected claims 1-27, with claims 28-62 withdrawn.

Applicants have added and provisionally elect new claims 63-101. Original claims 1-27 were canceled, and claims 28-62 withdrawn.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC §102(e) in View of Reese/ Interview Summary

On September 29, 2008, a brief telephone call took place between Examiner McLean and Applicants' representative Jennifer Bush regarding the pending Restriction Requirement and status of the case. The Examiner confirmed that the action was in fact a Restriction Requirement and that the Applicants thus had an opportunity to respond to the constructive election. The substance of the claims was not discussed.

Applicants here discuss rejections presented in the Office Action of February 22, 2008. In that action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 USC §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Reese et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,298,512). This rejection is traversed with respect currently pending claims.

Independent claims 63, 78, and 96 respectively recite a printer, method, and computer program product for printing time-based media. Claim 78 is representative:

In a printer with an embedded multimedia server, a method for printing time-based media content comprising:

performing multimedia content processing, comprising:

monitoring streaming media content from a time-based media source input to the printer;

selecting a portion of the streaming media content based on a plurality of user defined criteria;

indexing the selected portion of the streaming media content;

constructing a storable representation for the selected portion of the streaming media content; and

generating by the printer a printout of the storable representation.

These aspects of the invention are not disclosed by Reese. Reese discloses a printer with an embedded database driver to convert data input to a database compatible format. The Examiner alleged that Reese describes monitoring multimedia content based on criteria, indexing a content selection based on criteria, and generating an index document for the content selection in Column 4, lines 11-19 (The embedded web server enables the printer to

provide a web page that allows users to interact with the printer in order to control and/or provide information that is to be entered into a database. The information can include the database server name, database engine type, and database login information. Additionally, the web page might allow users to add additional ODBC data sources so that the printer could support proprietary or less popular database engines that are not already loaded in the printer memory). *See* Office Action at page 11. The embedded web server of Reese processes only static web pages, but is unable to monitor *streaming media content*, select a portion of the *streaming media content*, or index the selected portion of the *streaming media content* as recited in claims 63, 78, and 96. This difference is not trivial. Monitoring, selecting, and indexing streaming media requires significantly more sophisticated processing than necessary for static media, making the claimed multimedia server more difficult, and less likely, to be embedded in a printer device. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 78 are patentably distinguishable over Reese.

Claims 64-77, 79-95, and 97-101 variously depend from claims 63, 78, and 96, which were shown above to be patentable over the cited reference and which recite additional features not shown in the cited reference. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 64-77, 79-95, and 97-101 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

In addition, with respect to claims 72, 85, and 97 (former claims 35, 50, and 58, as rejected), Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Reese of “receiving user input... **indicating a participant speaker**,” “segmenting” and “indexing” the streaming media content based on the speaker in the recorded video meeting, nor “selecting a media clip...illustrating a time period” when the speaker is speaking in the recorded video meeting.

Thus claims 72, 85, and 97, and their dependent claims are further distinguishable over Reese for these additional reasons.

In addition, with respect to claims 64, 91, and 99 (former claims 3, 41, and 60, as rejected), Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Reese of receiving a document in a print job, extracting a URL from the document, retrieving a web page identified by the referenced URL, constructing a printable representation of the web page, associating the printable representation of the web page with a thumbnail image, nor displaying the thumbnail image in an embedded printer display. Thus, claims 64, 91, and 99, and their dependent claims are further distinguishable over Reese for these additional reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 63-101 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: November 25, 2008

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/

Attorneys for Assignee
Jennifer R. Bush
Registration No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200

20412/08351/DOCS/1997474.1